DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 197 SP 006 990

TITLE	Undergraduate Preparation of Educational Personnel Program. Program Information Materials.
INSTITUTION	Nebraska Univ., Lincoln.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 73
NOTE	30p.; Study Commission Newsletter; Vol. 1 No. 7, February 1, 1973
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Admission Criteria; College School Cooperation; Educational Responsibility; *Preservice Education; *Problems; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Programs; Teacher Selection

ABSTRACT

This document presents the guidelines for the Undergraduate Preparation of Educational Personnel (UPEP) program. Although the program has been cancelled, it states that the guidelines could serve as a model for later federal, state, or local programs and that the analysis of what is wrong with American teacher education is still viable. The UPEP program, it indicates, is designed to focus on several difficulties in the present system of educating teachers, which include the following: a) the fractionalization of responsibility for the education of teachers among the school of education, the arts and sciences, and the public school system; b) the inadequacy of the professional sequence; c) the difference of the liberal arts; d) the failure to recruit, select, counsel, and evaluate prospective teachers; and e) the almost complete absence of client or consumer participation in developing and monitoring the whole system of education. This document contains a description of the program's Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers (including descriptions of scope and purpose, an analysis of the need for reform, and descriptions of grants awarded through the program). (JA)

ED 083197

UNDERGRADUATE PREPARATION OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL PROGRAM

Program Information Materials

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP 006 990

OE/NCIES/NE/UPEP

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states that, "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Therefore, this Education Professions Development program, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, must be operated in compliance with this law.

AUTHORITY

Program for Improving the Undergraduate Preparation of Educational Personnel (UPEP)

The Education Professions Development Act (EPDA or P. L. 90-35), enacted in 1967, amends Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The main purpose of EPDA is to improve the quality of teaching and to help meet critical shortages of adequately trained educational personnel by: (1) developing information on the actual needs for educational personnel, both present and long range; (2) providing a broad range of high quality training and retraining opportunities, responsive to changing manpower needs; (3) attracting a greater number of qualified persons into the teaching profession; (4) attracting persons who can stimulate creativity in the arts and other skills to undertake short-term and long-term assignments in education; and (5) helping to make educational personnel training programs more responsive to the needs of the schools and colleges.

Part D of EPDA authorizes grants and contracts for improving "the qualifications of persons who are serving or preparing to serve in educational programs in elementary and secondary schools (including preschool and adult and vocational programs) or secondary vocational schools or to supervise or train persons so serving."

Activities affecting the undergraduate preparation of educational personnel were authorized when Part D of EPDA was amended by the Education Amendments Act of 1972 to add authorizations for:

> "(11) programs or projects (including cooperative arrangements or consortia between institutions of higher education, junior and community colleges, or between such institutions and state or local educational agencies and nonprofit education associations) for the improvement of undergraduate programs for preparing educational personnel, including design, development, and evaluation of exemplary undergraduate training programs, introduction of high quality and more effective curricula and curricula materials, and the provision of increased opportunities for practical teaching experience for prospective teachers in elementary and secondary schools." (Education Amendments Act of 1972, P. L. 92-318, section 147)

CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION..... iv

Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers..... v

SCOPE AND PURPOSE..... 1

An Analysis of the Need for Reform..... 4
Reform Trends in Higher Education..... 7

ELIGIBILITY..... 9

TYPES OF GRANTS..... 9

Grants to Local Education Agencies..... 9
Grants to Consortia..... 10
Grants to State Education Agencies..... 10

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES..... 10

Initial Grants Based at Institutions of Higher Education..... 10
Initial Grants Based at Local Education Agencies..... 13
Implementation Grants Based at Institutions of Higher Education..... 14
Implementation Grants Based at Local Education Agencies..... 17
Communication and Dissemination..... 17
Evaluation..... 17

PROGRAM CONDITIONS..... 18

Grants Based at Institutions of Higher Education..... 18
Grants Based at Local Education Agencies..... 21
Grants Based at State Education Agencies..... 23

INTRODUCTION

Since the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the U. S. Office of Education has made increasingly large commitments to the training of elementary and secondary school teachers. Those commitments have been limited almost exclusively to the inservice education of teachers and training at the advanced and graduate level. In fact, the Senate and House reports on the Education Professions Development Act, which brought together and broadened existing authorizations for teacher training, continued to prohibit the support of regular undergraduate programs. However, with the passage of the Education Amendments Act of 1972, which includes an amendment of EPDA (Part D), the Congress authorized for the first time a national program which addresses itself to the reform of the undergraduate education of teachers.

Reform of preservice education has been urged for many years and the literature is full of the ills and shortcomings of the initial preparation of teachers. While there have been many analyses and much discussion about the causes of the problems or their solution, no unanimity of opinion exists. Still, there is a growing consensus as to how reform might be commenced. Leadership is required to begin. The program for Undergraduate Preparation of Educational Personnel (UPEP) described herein has been authorized by the Congress to serve as the vehicle for that leadership.

The UPEP program will focus on several difficulties that appear to weaken the present system of educating teachers, among which are (a) the fractionalization of responsibility for the education of teachers among the school of education, the arts and sciences, and the public school systems; (b) the inadequacy of the professional sequence; (c) the indifference of the liberal arts; (d) the failure to recruit, select, counsel and evaluate prospective teachers; and (e) the almost complete absence of client or consumer participation in the development and monitoring of the whole system of educating teachers.

In addressing these concerns, UPEP will develop a process of reform, and test a variety of possibilities for achieving educational reform. UPEP is not intended to support the training of an individual teacher or to purchase the direct services of the resources of institutions of higher education or of the schools. The object of the reform is the institution of higher education itself and those school systems where the prospective teacher receives practical experience. The program begins at a time when the apparent surplus of teachers presents an opportunity to increase the quality of both undergraduate programs and the kind of prospective teacher

who is recruited. But before any broad attack on the complex problems of improving the undergraduate education of teachers can begin, additional evidence is needed to determine ways to effectively meet these problems.

Central to the UPEP effort is the explicit involvement of the arts and sciences in the undergraduate preparation of teachers. This is not new, but it will be the first time a major programmatic attempt has been made to bring about an effective and more meaningful commitment and collaboration of the arts and sciences to the education of teachers. Another concern is the improvement, and in many instances the establishment, of the setting where the prospective teacher receives his practical experience. In achieving this goal, UPEP also encourages institutions of higher education to use the resources of places and agencies other than the schools, as well as those of parents and students.

UPEP is a high risk program. Many of the wide variety of approaches that will be supported are, in part, untried and some may be viewed as unique from the ways teachers have been educated in the past. Some of the practices which UPEP will encourage have already been developed or are only partially developed, but mostly as isolated experiments. UPEP will try to bring many such efforts together in a coherent whole.

As a high risk program, UPEP will be reaching out to the most imaginative and creative energies that can be found in institutions of higher education; it will tap the reforming aspects in those institutions which are already visible, and is prepared to try unusual approaches to the education of teachers. It requires the commitment of the whole of the institution and of the most significant portions of the cooperating school system.

The major result of the UPEP program is expected to be a more sophisticated understanding of the processes of change that are needed if the undergraduate education of teachers can be improved, as well as a better idea of the effect and limitations of Federal efforts to achieve this kind of a limited goal through planned institutional change.

Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers

In August 1971 the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems (NCIES), which administers the UPEP program, funded a three-year project, the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, directed by Dr. Paul A. Olson at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The Commission has several purposes

which bear directly on those of the UPEP program. It seeks to develop ways to bring colleges of education and liberal arts and other segments of higher education together in a more genuinely collaborative effort to improve the education of teachers. It has initiated a variety of studies to develop more meaningful ways to evaluate both existing and developmental programs concerned with the education of teachers; and it will disseminate the results of the efforts to various constituencies intimately concerned with teaching and the education of teachers as well as to the public at large.

As part of its task in helping NCIES develop and launch a program which attempts, essentially, to reform undergraduate education, the Study Commission has prepared a value statement, which the Commission has distributed throughout the country and has also included in its report on Of Education and Human Community. This statement queries many traditional notions and practices in American education--notions and practices which have triggered the need for such a sweeping reform as is envisaged by UPEP.

SCOPE AND PURPOSE

This program will seek to remedy four major problems:

--the failure of the academic disciplines* outside the school of education to concern themselves with the preparation of teachers.

UPEP will encourage the liberal arts and sciences, which provide the largest portion of the prospective teacher's undergraduate preparation, to involve themselves more effectively in the education of teachers, and to create new forms and methods of liberal education more attuned to career needs and less oriented to research;

--the inadequacy of the professional aspect of preservice education.

UPEP will put special emphasis on the creation of more effective ways to unite educational theory and clinical experience so that the teacher is prepared to meet classroom realities;

--the general failure of institutions of higher education with large commitments to the education of prospective teachers to select, supervise and evaluate the performance of these students.

UPEP will seek to develop more effective means to select and judge prospective teachers.

--the failure of higher education and clinical schools to assess their product and to involve their clients--local education agencies and parents--in determining what sorts of teachers are needed for effective education.

UPEP will devise new approaches to intersystemic cooperation in the education of prospective teachers.

---

*The terms "liberal arts and sciences" or "academic disciplines" will be used to refer to all the academic segments of the institution outside the school of education which impinge on the undergraduate preparation of prospective teachers. Similarly, the term "institutional reform" refers to changes within those segments of the institution of higher education affecting the undergraduate preparation of prospective teachers. Many institutions have segments and components with little or no relationship to undergraduate education in general or to the undergraduate preparation of teachers in particular.

In order to improve the institution's ability to carry out substantive changes in the above areas, UPEP seeks institutional reforms which increase the emphasis given to the undergraduate education of teachers and enhance the quality of programs offered and attract candidates to those programs who show promise of becoming more effective teachers. It is proceeding on the assumption that there are reform elements now active which are available as resources for the beginning of promising reforms. UPEP will seek to encourage and capitalize on these groups. Clearly, not every institution will have the perfect combination of reform groups, but UPEP will seek to affect the balance of forces in grantee institutions or groups of institutions in ways which will give substance to the very fundamental changes which the program believes is necessary to improve the quality of preservice preparation.

At present preservice education for educational personnel is the province of institutions of higher education (IHEs). Unlike students entering most other professions, future teachers are trained on the undergraduate level; their education is commonly divided between the school or department of education, which gives them pedagogical skills, and the arts and science disciplines such as English or history or biology, which expose future teachers in common with other undergraduates to the substantive bases of knowledge.

The difficulties of such a situation will be traced below. Here it is sufficient to note that although this type of approach has become typical of American society, it is neither ancient nor immutable. Until the last few decades most teachers were trained in normal schools standing outside the usual ambit of higher education.

UPEP will explore various possibilities for reform. Although the major emphasis will be on undergraduate-based programs, the program will award grants to support a variety of different modes of training. Accordingly, UPEP will fund one or two developmental efforts to devise such major alternatives to the present system as public school-based training programs. These activities will be in addition to grants awarded to IHEs with the present system of teacher education.

During the past few years the Office of Education has sought to develop a variety of different ways to improve the performance of the educational system--especially the performance of educational personnel. These efforts have taken many forms, but they are based on a set of common premises:

--that the education of a nation's children can be improved by selective national efforts which use Federal dollars to catalyze local resources and energies;

--that performance can be improved through intervention in a few vital areas of the educational system such as the education of educational personnel;

--that the concepts and techniques behind the system approach offer valid lessons for educational reform to draw on;

--that non-professionals--consumers such as parents and neighborhood-community people--have a role in determining the directions of educational reform in the preparation of teachers.

Very little is known about the best way to bring about educational change--at least change of the magnitude needed to insure that all of the nation's children get an education which gives them an adequate start in life. It is known, however, that "program change" requires institutional change--that there is no such thing as people-proof reforms or universally valid packaged products; that institutional change takes time (a minimum of five years to effect the changes of the scope anticipated by this program) and that the required changes may very well extend far beyond the confines of what is normally thought of as the formal educational system. Often the most critical factors in the success or failure of any reform program may, in fact, be outside the area which the program has taken as its province. What happens in adjacent institutions--human service and religious institutions, civic planning agencies or industry--may be as crucial to the education of prospective teachers and children as what happens in the school or the institution of higher education.

Current information is not sufficient. Accordingly, the Office of Education has started to move toward the development of "action research" programs which will yield the government basic engineering knowledge about the best way to proceed. In a recent report, the National Council on Education Professions Development has called for efforts:

> to explore the merits of various general strategies of reform and improvement so that the Congress and the Executive Branch may make a determination as to how the Federal government can make its most effective contribution to the strengthening of the nation's educational system.*

UPEP is a demonstration effort which seeks to advance our knowledge about the most effective ways to bring about desired changes in the

---

*A Report on Educational Renewal, p. 9.

preservice education of educational personnel. The program will develop new information, but its basic purpose is to test out the information which is now becoming available regarding promising avenues for institutional reform. Because UPEP is as much concerned with "educating" the appropriate constituencies as it is in reforming the particular institutions which receive UPEP grants, dissemination and evaluation components within a common framework will be essential and integral parts of the program's activities.

At the end of the five years, UPEP will seek to have generated sufficient information to enable the Office of Education to move to a second phase of reform which will tackle the general problems involved in reforming the entire structure of the undergraduate education of teachers.

An Analysis of the Need for Reform

The UPEP program is a national response to a national problem that has persisted for over a half century. A number of circumstances have developed in recent years which have sharply focused attention of the need for the reform of the education of teachers:

1. There is general dissatisfaction with the low quality of current efforts.

   This dissatisfaction is felt by all groups involved--the new teachers, the school systems that hire them, the communities in which they work, and even the educators who train them. All agree on the need for major alterations in existing methods. Overwhelming descriptive and analytical evidence testifies to the new teacher's sense of insufficiency and uncertainty, as well as to his quick perception of the gap between training and reality. This educational disability has been especially marked in urban classrooms, but it is becoming apparent in other situations as well. Teachers are not being prepared to do the job well. In situations which are markedly different from their own backgrounds, they are often not doing the job at all. As a result many of the best leave the profession; those who stay often need and desire large scale, expensive re-training while in service.

2. No one takes responsibility for the education of teachers.

   More than a third of the nation's college graduates seek certification to teach. At many state colleges and universities the percentage is far higher. Despite this, and despite the fact that most of the

teacher's education takes place in the arts and sciences, many universities see teacher education as a technical problem which they consign to poorly-supported schools of education, isolated from the liberal arts program. The major resources of many of these schools of education are devoted to research rather than to the business of training teachers, and the training programs are often designed in isolation from the school systems and the community. There seldom is an attempt to measure the effectiveness of their training programs, or even to use evaluation as a pointer in curriculum redesign.

3. Despite its ostensible role as an educational institution, the university devotes little academic attention to the problems of education.

The education of teachers is not the only area victimized by this attitude. Undergraduate education in general suffers from the pervasive graduate school orientation and value-system of higher education. Most of the faculty which provide undergraduate education concentrate on the accumulation rather than the application of knowledge. As a result, areas of concern to American society (and of vital interest to teachers)--problems of technology and social change, urban growth and cultural pluralism--cannot be handled effectively within the present professional pattern of higher education. Most liberal arts departments are oriented toward the production of academic specialists. These departments have failed to revise their practices, first, to take more fully into account the fact that most of the students in the class are not going on to college teaching; and second, to develop interdisciplinary courses with other departments which will particularly benefit prospective teachers.

4. Prospective teachers are not being prepared to assume non-traditional roles.

Despite the consensus of expert opinion which looks toward major changes in the role and structure of education during the rest of this century, undergraduates preparing to teach are not being given the flexibility to cope with these changes. Elementary and secondary school curricula increasingly emphasize the notion that the fundamental purpose of education is to give the student the tools of critical inquiry. Teacher education has not caught up with this idea. In addition, present systems of teacher education have failed to recognize that there are many "teacher-like" positions outside the public schools, or that teachers might very well take increasing responsibility for effective education in a variety of social and cultural settings. As things stand now, the teacher education system

provides inflexible preparation for an inflexible career. It does not now allow parents and other non-professionals--those directly affected by the system--a significant voice in either the form or the content of the educational process.

5. The current system is not only inflexible; it is also inefficient.

The recent surplus of new teachers has illustrated the waste inherent in present methods. It is becoming increasingly clear that undergraduates seeking to enter today's labor market require technical skills and knowledge that go beyond the general education curriculum. This is as true of teachers as it is of potential social workers. Yet, in education, large numbers of poorly-counseled students are given a general education which is explicitly separate from their future vocational needs and a technical skill-base which fits them only for public school teaching. These skills are not transferable, despite the existence of great numbers of "teacher-like" positions outside the schoolhouse. The converse situation--one with a shortage of teachers such as existed in the sixties and is expected again in the mid-eighties--finds the training system poorly equipped to provide short-term training to entrants from other fields. Such an inelastic system sacrifices the economic, social, and educational benefits of inter-occupational mobility without reaping commensurate advantages in the form of a higher level of occupational expertise. Teaching calls for skills which can and should be transferable to other occupations. In the interest of efficiency, the system which educates teachers should capitalize on these possibilities by stressing the transferability of skills at the same time as it increases the quality of training.

6. Successful efforts to improve teacher education have often failed to affect other institutions and components of the same institution.

The isolated, cumbersome nature of the system militates against the wide-scale adoption of innovative ideas. Present accreditation and certification practices reinforce the most inflexible and regressive elements in the existing system and block many proposed innovations and reforms. The clients of the teacher training process--parents, particularly parents of children whose teachers are least adequate--are commonly not admitted as parties in the private or quasi-public credentialling and certification processes. Generally, the system acts to process teachers; it cannot be said either to motivate or train them.

7. The current system fails to tap the resources of individuals outside education.

   Education deals with human development, but the system of educating teachers has signally ignored the ways in which community people, state and local government personnel, artisans, and those from other professions could help to give teachers the imaginative and critical education which will enable them to cope with today's cultural and social conditions.

8. Trends within the teaching profession may diminish the chances for fundamental reform.

   The movement toward unionization and increased practitioner control over the teaching profession offers considerable promise of improving the quality of teacher education. At the same time there exists the possibility that this movement may lead to the kind of "professional" control and insensitivity toward broader public concerns that have been roundly attacked in medicine and law. At the same time the new emphasis on teacher rights may lead to specialization of professional tasks, resulting in limits on the kinds of flexibility that reform requires.

9. The failures of education have pressed with particular harshness on the disadvantaged minorities.

   Teachers who confront the particular problems of educating disadvantaged children have seldom been trained for this especially demanding work. In large part this failure can be attributed to the implicit monocultural attitude and rigid intellectual structure of higher education and the schools in which teachers gain practical experience.

Reform Trends in Higher Education

UPEP is intended for institutions or clusters of institutions that are ready to make important changes in their programs to educate teachers. A number of significant trends in higher education during the past few years have increased the chances of such an effort. Some of the favorable developments are these:

1. People in higher education are beginning to recognize that the reward system for faculty at most colleges and universities, which is keyed to research and publication and specialized teaching in one's discipline,

works against achieving the *high quality of undergraduate education* which prospective teachers must have.

2. There is a national trend toward allowing student evaluation of faculty to influence faculty promotion, retention, and selection policies.

3. In a number of programs, both federally and locally supported, parents or neighborhood clients of the schools have assumed a major role in determining what the process of undergraduate education for teachers should be and what kinds of teachers should emerge from the process.

4. Related to the increase of student influence on faculty is the trend toward field-based teaching and internships in education, psychology, sociology, anthropology, political science, art, music and ecology (to name a few areas that relate to teacher preparation). Such programs frequently require the cooperation of the neighborhood or area in which the field work is set.

5. There has been a dramatic increase of interest in interdisciplinary courses, especially in ecology and related areas.

6. The teacher surplus has placed school systems in a more selective and demanding position than they have had for many years. As a consequence, colleges and universities are now in competition with one another to place their graduates. The surplus is increasing the pressure on these institutions to make careful assessment of whether what they do in fact works. Moreover, schools of education are being asked to justify their budgets and to provide programmatic justifications for producing more teachers than can be placed in the schools.

7. There has been a rapid growth in two-year colleges, which serve many students who formerly would have had no access to higher education and who are interested in preparation for education and other social services.

8. Experimental efforts such as the University Without Walls consortium are developing alternative methods of higher education.

9. Institutions are becoming more attuned to the needs of their client schools and communities and are developing a variety of linkages leading to much more emphasis on direct experience in schools and communities where prospective teachers are to be employed. However, this emphasis is not as widespread as it ought to be, and efforts to give adequate funding and governance to such efforts--particularly where they fall between the school system and the institution of higher education--have

often foundered because differing taxing and governance systems are involved in the IHE and the school segment.

10. In urban areas especially it is becoming evident that the school cannot be seen in isolation from human-service concerns such as housing, nitrition, mental and physical health and law enforcement.

ELIGIBILITY

Grants under this program may be awarded to institutions of higher education, state and local educational agencies, including consortia or cooperative arrangements between institutions of higher education, junior and community colleges, or between such institutions and state or local educational agencies and nonprofit education associations.

TYPES OF GRANTS

Grants under this program will be competitively awarded and will be of two types: initial grants, for a period normally of one year or more; and implementation grants, which will normally extend for approximately five years.

Initial grants will be awarded to plan for and begin institutional reforms through study, problem analysis, needs assessment, program design and the development of coordination among institutions of higher education, local education agencies, and affected communities.

Implementation grants will be awarded for the purpose of transition from existing to new approaches for educating prospective educators, evaluation, and the dissemination of promising practices. The Commissioner shall review each grant yearly for continuation. Continuation decisions will be based upon evidence of satisfactory progress toward meeting program goals and the availability of funds.

Grants to Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

Although the objective of the UPEP program--the reform of the preparation of prospective educational personnel--dictates a major emphasis on institutions of higher education, local education agencies (LEAs) are also eligible to request assistance for the development of school system-based

exemplary programs. It is anticipated that grants will be made to several LEAs to conduct school system-based reforms of the undergraduate preparation of prospective teachers. The purpose of these grants is to investigate the feasibility of professional education in the school setting, while at the same time increasing the mutual collaboration of LEAs and IHEs. Two different types of school system-based grant applications will be entertained: applications from an LEA and its consortia or cooperative groupings of an LEA and IHE. Because of the limited state of the art, these grants will be experimental and flexible. Additional requirements for such school system-based efforts are included herein.

Grants to Consortia

Consortia or cooperative groupings receiving UPEP grants will be those whose constituent institutions have clearly defined mutual relationships in the education of prospective educators. The purpose of grant awards to such consortia or groupings is to bring about basic reforms in the institutions preparing prospective educators, through such means as pooling resources, specialization of functions, and coordinated curricula.

Grants to State Education Agencies (SEAs)

Applications will be entertained from state education agencies (SEAs) having the authority to develop more articulated systems that will meet UPEP goals for the education of prospective teachers through coordination of efforts by IHEs, LEAs, and communities.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Initial Grants Based at Institutions of Higher Education

Initial grants will be awarded to institutions or consortia of institutions which provide acceptable evidence that they are ready to make important changes in programs impinging on the education of prospective teachers. These grants will make it possible to explore alternative modes of reform, develop detailed plans for implementation, assess feasible changes and begin implementation of plans as they are developed.

The initial, or first-phase grantee who wishes to be considered for implementation grants will be expected to demonstrate a commitment to the ultimate objectives of the UPEP program. Such a commitment must

extend to most of the parts of the IHE related to the undergraduate education of teachers, including those parts of the governance structure which control the allocation of financial and personnel resources.

Specifically, during the initial grant, if the grantee is an institution of higher education or consortium, it will develop (through the means described in the Requirements section) the following reports and analyses:

1. A clear statement of the grantee's goals for undergraduate education, as distinct from graduate education.

2. An analysis of the way the grantee is currently allocating financial and other resources to meet these goals.

3. An analysis of the relationship of these goals and allocations to the education of prospective teachers.

4. A description of past efforts to devise an instructional program to satisfy the goals above, and an assessment of the program's success or failure.

   --This analysis should include a description of efforts particularly focused on the grantee's primary service area.

5. A description of how major policies are developed and implemented in regard to:

   --curriculum planning
   --budget allocation
   --promotion, allocation of faculty positions and tenure
   --cooperative relationships with other agencies such as local education agencies
   --relationships with other institutions of higher education within the state and state agencies connected with higher education

In addition the following activities will be carried out during the first phase:

6. An assessment of needs for the preservice education of teachers in schools being served by the institution of higher education, with accompanying recommendations for reforms based on that assessment.

   --This assessment is expected to take cognizance of the requirements and nature of the student body and communities in local education

agencies which are the major employers of teachers produced by the participating institution. Having identified the more pressing and unmet needs of the students, the assessment will determine the knowledge, skills and other attributes needed by LEA teachers and shall make recommendations for changes in the undergraduate education of the teacher, including improvements in the practicum. With the technical assistance of the institution of higher education, this assessment will be made by non-university members of the governance council, which includes local education agency teachers and administrators, parents and other members of the community. (See Program Conditions section.)

--Following submission of the assessment and recommendations, the group will work with the institution and the cooperating local education agencies where the practicum takes place to begin formulation and implementation of the needed reforms.

7. A student-generated analysis of the grantee's formal governance and decision-making structures and an evaluation of the extent to which the grantee is currently meeting the goals specified above.

--So that students may preserve a sense of independence, they will have a separately-controlled budget (agreed to by the institution and student representatives on the governance council) for this purpose.

8. A series of recommendations for reform based on the preceding analyses in the areas of:

--curriculum, programs and teaching format
--management and organization of the institution
--budgeting and resources allocation, including program budgeting if appropriate
--strategies for presenting, winning acceptance of, and accomplishing desired changes, along with cost estimates.

9. Recommendations for mechanisms for implementation, and a time-schedule for transition.

10. Plans for changes in the clinical, professional, and arts and science sequence for prospective teachers.

11. Statements as to how the plans for changes in the education of prospective teachers will require changes in credentialling and accreditation practices, and an assessment of possible courses of action that might be pursued to bring these about.

12. An analysis of possible plans for follow-up evaluations of teachers after graduation, including cost estimates.

--These plans should deal with such questions as methods of assessing competencies and the community role in evaluation. They will be made in cooperation with teachers' groups. These contingency plans will be assessed by the institution during the implementation phase.

13. Plans to place a new priority on the undergraduate education of teachers by developing transitional schedules which would:

--create faculty slots for teachers of interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary courses

--adopt promotion and tenure regulations which will encourage the academic disciplines to reward work bearing directly on the education of prospective teachers

--develop student-run evaluations of faculty performance (it is expected that these evaluations will influence tenuring and promotion decisions)

--add adjunct faculty from the community where appropriate and useful, to teach in practitioner-oriented arts and sciences courses.

Initial Grants Based at Local Education Agencies

If the grantee is a local education agency designing a school system-based reform, it will develop:

1. Structures for the governance of the grant that will assure parity relationships among those affected by the reform--parents, prospective teachers, teachers and supervisory personnel employed by the LEA, and representatives from the IHE's administration, faculty, and student body. (See Program Requirement 2, the governance council).

2. Additional professional resources in the school system for the supervision and training of prospective teachers.

3. New curricula and training models for prospective teachers.

4. Closer relationships with the cooperating IHE, including the arts and sciences departments as well as the school of education.

5. Methods for monitoring and evaluating the reforms.

6. Methods for dissemination.

Implementation Grants Based at Institutions of Higher Education

These grants will be awarded, beginning in FY 1974, to provide large-scale stable funding which will improve the quality of performance in the areas below:

1. More effective undergraduate instruction.

During the life of the implementation grant, UPEP grantees are expected to re-orient curricular efforts to achieve the following objectives:

--greater emphasis on the undergraduate's communications and behavioral skills (explanation, synthesis, teaching, questioning), rather than on the accumulation of knowledge in traditional frameworks

--creation or expansion of inter-disciplinary and practitioner-oriented courses which will illustrate how the knowledge of existing disciplines can be applied to specific intellectual and practical problems

--more flexible curricular paths to the degree, incorporating credit for different kinds of relevant work and clinical experience

--use of faculty from the arts and sciences as supervisors of clinical experiences for both prospective elementary and secondary school teachers and students preparing for college instruction. These activities will be pursued in conjunction with faculty from the school of education and teachers from cooperating school districts

--greater emphasis on learning theory in the arts and sciences.

In its efforts to re-animate the undergraduate education of teachers, the institution is expected to foster collaborative work between education and other practice-oriented fields such as social work, city planning and architecture, public health, law, etc. The requirements of prospective teachers will in many cases overlap those of undergraduates preparing for these allied fields; both classroom and clinical collaboration may prove valuable.

2. The professional component of the education of teachers.

UPEP also seeks major improvements in the professional education of prospective teachers, including both theoretical instruction and the practicum.

The program will seek practicum experiences which will:

--be multi-year, with increasing demands on the undergraduate, going from observation through tutoring and small group teaching to actual classroom instruction

--emphasize participation, rather than observation, by college students

--be developed in partnership with teachers and administrators from cooperating school districts

--forge new connections between the institution of higher education, the local education agencies which absorb the institution's teacher graduates, and the communities they jointly serve

--provide experiences with different socio-economic levels and/or cultural groups

--offer college students preparing for other occupations the opportunity to participate in clinical programs

--specify desired outcomes and provide criteria for the evaluation of the prospective teacher's performance

--provide clinical experiences in as wide a variety of settings as possible, including cognate human-service areas such as health and social work and youth-serving organizations

--prepare teachers to be, in the broadest sense, to be active participants in the community they will serve by giving them investigatory skills so that they can understand that community's particular culture and sociology

--be related to needs assessments defining the major problems, discrepancies, and areas requiring attention in the particular systems in which the bulk of the institution's teachers serve.

In this process, it is important that communities served by the institution make the needs assessment and assume the most significant role consonant with legal constraints on the governance systems of the LEA, institution or consortium.

In addition, UPEP will seek more effective instructional systems which:

--are tied to the specific problems posed in the clinical experience

--emphasize on-site and diverse experiences

--link faculties of several disciplines

--are designed to integrate theory and practice by a focus on performance in specific clinical situations

--are designed to develop a repertoire of teaching skills, such as skills in classroom management and pupil diagnosis

--are designed to provide students with generalizable communications skills.

In redesigning its professional program the institution is encouraged to apply the principles of performance criteria for evaluating student achievement. Key features of the competency-based teacher education movement may provide a useful framework for strengthening institutional plans for more viable professional education program components. The institution is also encouraged to examine, and where feasible to adopt, such new products and practices as protocol and training materials, or Office of Education and National Institute of Education (NIE) products.

3. Selection, counseling and evaluation.

In order to improve these functions, the grantee institution will be expected to develop or use:

--increased resources for counseling prospective teachers

--tests and other means to evaluate the prospective teacher's knowledge of substantive areas as well as commitment to teaching

--means of involving the arts and sciences faculty in these processes

--follow-up of graduated teachers in order to determine where the new teachers sought and found jobs, to determine the nature of their subsequent inservice training, and to evaluate the reasons for success or failure of the institution's graduated teachers. (This information is <u>not</u> intended to evaluate individuals but to re-examine and revise existing programs to educate teachers; procedures for this type of

analysis will be developed in close coordination with teachers and teacher groups).

Implementation Grants Based at Local Education Agencies

Several school system-based grants will be awarded to develop various means of reforming the undergraduate education of educators by bringing that education into closer articulation with the particular needs of students in the school system. School system-based reforms will test the hypothesis that the early years of the prospective educator's undergraduate education are the responsibility of the college or university, while the later years which focus on the technical or professional aspects of the prospective educator's education can more effectively be handled by the school system. Accordingly, the proposed school system-based reform will include both on-campus and off-campus activities. The community or communities served by the LEA will be heavily involved in planning and implementing the reform. The applicant LEA must provide evidence that it is ready to commit substantial resources to the preparation of teachers and that it has a close relationship with the IHE which will participate in the intended reform. These objectives apply as well to applications from consortia of an institution of higher education and a local education agency.

Communication and Dissemination

In addition to awarding institutional grants, UPEP will foster other activities designed to increase the cumulative impetus of change. One of the major objectives of the program is to construct a dissemination network linking grantees as well as other institutions undergoing or contemplating analogous changes, and therefore grantees will be expected to budget funds for dissemination.

Evaluation

During the initial grant, grantees will begin development of an on-going evaluation of the reform process; this evaluation will be designed to become a permanent part of the reform itself. The evaluation, to be monitored by the governance council, will be supported from grant funds. The Office of Education will provide technical assistance for the development and implementation of this on-going evaluative effort. A guide to the development of this evaluation will be prepared by the UPEP program and distributed during the initial grant period.

In addition, the Office of Education will conduct a national evaluation of the UPEP program in order to determine factors making for grantee success or failure. Since this effort is basic to the purpose of the UPEP program, the cooperation of each grantee will be required.

During the initial grant period the institution will lay comprehensive plans for both dissemination and its own evaluation, as well as provide assistance in national evaluations. During the implementation phase, grantees will be expected to set aside a total of 10 per cent of their grants for dissemination and evaluation. Plans for the administration and use of these funds will be determined in consultation with the Office of Education.

PROGRAM CONDITIONS

Grants Based at Institutions of Higher Education

All IHE-based activities during both the initial and implementation grants will be expected to meet the following general conditions:

1. Grant Director--UPEP grants will be channeled through the office of the president of the institution. The president is authorized either to retain direct control over administration of the grant or delegate day-to-day responsibilities to faculty members of other major administrative officers with broad responsibilities in connection with undergraduate education (such as the provost, vice president for academic affairs, etc.). The grant director must be a full-time employee of the grantee institution.

If the president decides to appoint a grant director from faculty ranks:

--the grant director will be tenured
--he will devote at least 50 per cent of his time to grant activities
--he will report directly to the president
--if possible, he will be physically located in the central administrative office.

The president shall designate the name and position of the directing official.

The president or the grant director will be responsible for developing policy, making budgetary decisions for administration of the grant, and establishing evaluation and governance procedures. He will be the chairman

of the governance council described below. He will be responsible for producing the reports and assessment described above (see "Program Objectives," p. 10), developing detailed implementation plans, and presenting the results of the planning effort for institutional debate and review.

The grant director is expected to work closely with and rely upon the assistance of the governance council described below. In any case where the grant goes to a consortium, the superintendent or chief administrator of the participating institution will be the formal recipient of the grant.

2. Governance Council

A governance council will be set up during the initial grant period. Details of representation and selection of members will be set forth in the initial proposal.

The governance council will be made up of representatives of the following groups:

a. the institution's administration
b. faculty from the science and mathematics departments
c. faculty from the social sciences and humanities
d. faculty from the school or department of education
e. students (it is anticipated that students will include both education and non-education majors)
f. local education agency administrators
g. local education agency teachers (if possible, those with experience as supervisors of student teachers)
h. parents from cooperating school districts
i. representatives from community or other outside groups
j. the grant director

The governance council, in cooperation with the grant director, is responsible for such activities as:

a. policy in regard to the administration of the grant
b. the reports and analyses described under the "initial grant" section (student members of the council will have the specific responsibility for the student-generated statements mentioned in that section)
c. management of debate within the institution on proposed reforms
d. coordination with cooperating agencies and communities being served
e. cooperation and information-sharing with other UPEP sites and interested institutions

f. direction of internal evaluations and assessment of grant activities
g. direction of the institution's participation in clinical arrangements
h. other responsibilities as mutually agreed on by the council, the grant director, and the president of the institution

3. Joint Participation of the Arts and Sciences and the School of Education

Proposals should be designed to bring together the academic disciplines and the school of education to:

a. explore new institutional patterns for focusing the different segments of the university on the common problem of the education of teachers;

b. develop ways to transcend the institutional departmentalization and bureaucracy which limit the possibilities for reform; and

c. encourage diversity and the recognition of cultural differences in the recruitment and education of teachers.

This requires cooperative arrangements (such as, but going beyond, joint appointments) that would affect the general education of prospective teachers and the technical aspects of the education of teachers but would mainly look at the purposes, rationale and success of the overall course structure. There would be a re-examination of the "professional education" and the "liberal arts" curriculum and an investigation of the feasibility of devising new techniques to fuse the two components, through such methods as joint program budgeting, joint curriculum committees, or joint committees to act on promotion and tenure for college teachers who have a direct or indirect role in the education of teachers. Client groups and school people will have a formal or informal role in such committees.

4. Local Education Agency Participation

Local education agencies involved in the governance council, and in the grant as a whole, should be those which either absorb a high percentage of the institution's newly-prepared teachers, hire a large percentage of their total newly-recruited staff from the institution, or are geographically contiguous with or close to the institution.

The designation of the agency or agencies involved is left to the proposing institution, which should indicate the basis for its selection in its

formal proposal for first-phase funding. The extent of cooperation which is feasible depends on the extent to which the applicant is a regional institution the bulk of whose graduates, both teachers and non-teachers, return to well-defined and nearby areas. In their proposal, the institution should make a clear definition of the region or locality being served, and of its concept of its mission and its responsibility to the area.

5. Community Participation

While various government programs have required community participation and established criteria for achieving it, there is no single model that insures broad-based, effective representation of and participation by the community in a variety of situations. It is expected that each grantee will develop its own mechanism and rationale for identifying and recruiting community representatives.

The socio-economic composition of the community group should reflect the community and local education agency identified as the location for the clinical experience. (See Local Education Agency Participation above for criteria).

Grants Based at Local Education Agencies

All LEA-based activities during both the initial and implementation grants will be expected to meet the following general conditions:

1. Grant director--UPEP grants will be channeled through the office of the superintendent of the LEA, who is authorized either to retain direct control over administration of the grant or delegate day-to-day responsibilities to a full-time member of his staff.

If the superintendent chooses to appoint a grant director from among his staff:

--the grant director will be a full-time staff member
--he will devote at least 50 per cent of his time to grant activities
--he will report directly to the superintendent
--he will be physically located in the central administrative offices
--at least 50 per cent of his salary and associated benefits will be provided by the LEA

The superintendent shall designate the name and position of the directing official in the formal application for initial funding.

The duties of the grant director will be the same as those described for the grant director for IHE-based grants. The requirement for the production of reports and analyses will be modified in accord with the special circumstances of LEA-based grants.

2. Governance Council

A governance council will be set up during the initial grant period. Details of representation and selection of members will be set forth in the initial application.

The governance council will include representatives of the following groups:

a. IHE faculty, including representatives from the college of arts and sciences as well as the school or department of education
b. LEA administration
c. faculty of the LEA, including those experienced as supervisors of student teachers
d. parents from the LEA
e. representatives of the community or other outside groups
f. prospective teachers and other students from the cooperating IHE (both education and non-education majors)
g. the grant director

The governance council, in cooperation with the grant director, is responsible for such activities as:

a. policy in regard to the administration of the grant
b. coordination with cooperating agencies, institutions and communities
c. cooperation and information-sharing with other UPEP sites and interested institutions
d. direction of internal evaluations and assessment of grant activities
e. other responsibilities as mutually agreed on by the council, the grant director, and the superintendent.

3. Institution of Higher Education Participation

The IHE represented in the governance council should be the institution which is participating in the reform. The institution will normally provide a large portion of the LEA's new teachers as well as of the LEA's student teachers, and would normally be in geographical proximity to the LEA.

The designation of the IHE is left to the LEA, which should indicate the basis for its decision in the application.

4. Community Participation (See Grants Based at Institution of Higher Education)

Grants Based at State Education Agencies

Grants to state education agencies will be for the reform of the undergraduate preparation of prospective teachers, including reform of the practicum. Grant requirements for grants based at local education agencies will also apply to these grants.